

PLEASE KEEP THIS AGENDA FOR THE MAY 28 MEETING.  
FIRST READING ITEMS IN THIS AGENDA  
WILL NOT BE DUPLICATED FOR SECOND READING.

FILE COPY

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate  
Tuesday, May 21, 1996  
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

*4.9.96 minutes  
were removed!*

- I. Minutes: Approval of the April 9, 1996 Academic Senate meeting (pp. 3-5 attached).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
  - D. Statewide Senators:
  - E. CFA Campus President:
  - F. Staff Council representative:
  - G. ASI representatives:
  - H. IACC representative:
  - I. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
  - A. **Elections for Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1996-1998 year:** No petitions for these positions have been received to date. Nominations will be received on the floor of the Senate. In order to be nominated for any of these positions, the individual must be present at the meeting.
  - B. **Resolution on Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program:** Gowgani, chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, second reading (pp. 20-26 in your 4.30.96 agenda).
  - C. **Resolution on External Review:** Peck, chair of the Program Review & Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 6-7 attached).
  - D. **Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Program Review:** Peck, chair of the Program Review & Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 8-12 attached).
  - E. **Resolution on Proposal to Establish an Environmental Biotechnology Institute:** Cano, Biological Sciences Department, second reading (pp. 37-48 in your 4.30.96 agenda).
  - F. **Resolution in Support of the Charter Governance Committee Proposal for the Cal Poly Governance Council:** Gooden, faculty representative to the Charter Governance Committee, second reading (pp. 13-27 attached).

-----> continued on page two

- G. **Resolution on Credit for Advanced Placement Exams:** Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (p. 28 attached).
- H. **Resolution on the Academic Calendar: First Day of Instruction:** Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (p. 29 attached).
- I. **Resolution on Policy on Amorous Relationships:** Swartz, chair of the Status of Women Committee, first reading (pp. 30-33 attached).
- J. **Resolution on Allocation of Cal Poly Funds:** Hood, chair of the Budget Committee, first reading (p. 34 attached).
- K. **Resolution on Input into Campus Planning:** Greenwald, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (p. 35 attached).

**THE FOLLOWING THREE RESOLUTIONS WILL BE SECOND-READING ITEMS AT THE MAY 28 MEETING. THEY WILL BE THE FIRST THREE ITEMS DELIBERATED AT THAT MEETING. [PLEASE BRING YOUR 4.30.96 AGENDA TO THE MAY 28 MEETING.]**

- A. **Resolution on Information Competence:** Connely, member of the Computer Literacy Subcommittee, second reading (pp. 59-60 in your 4.30.96 agenda).
- B. **Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed Administrative Structure:** Hampsey, chair of the GEB Ad Hoc Committee, second reading (cover memo on pp. 49-52, resolution on pp. 53-56 in your 4.30.96 agenda).
- C. **Resolution to Approve Proposed General Education and Breadth Four Unit Template:** Hampsey, chair of the GEB Ad Hoc Committee, second reading, (cover memo on pp. 49-52, resolution on pp. 57-58 in your 4.30.96 agenda).

VI. Discussion Item(s):  
**The Cal Poly Plan:** ongoing discussion.

VII. Adjournment:

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California

**Background**

The purpose of external review is to provide the opportunity for objective outside input on academic programs. For some academic programs, accreditation review serves this purpose. For programs which are not subject to accreditation review, formal external review provides a mechanism for outside input.

In academic departments that offer more than one degree, external review of the degree programs may be combined into a single review. Non-degree granting academic departments will also undergo external review. Where accreditation review occurs at the College level, this review can be considered as an external review of a program within the college as long as the accreditation report makes substantive comments about individual programs within the College. Interdisciplinary degree programs may be evaluated by a single external review, as long as the review team is appropriately constituted.

RESOLUTION ON EXTERNAL REVIEW

AS- -96/

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| WHEREAS,  | The Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism document has identified external program review as necessary; and   |
| WHEREAS,  | specialized accreditation is not available for some degree programs or available accreditation may be deemed unnecessary by the department and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, be it therefore              |
| RESOLVED, | that all degree programs, in consultation with their college dean, will seek either specialized accreditation or undergo external review; and be it further  |
| RESOLVED, | that the timing of external review efforts be coordinated with the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee to minimize the workload of the program faculty in preparing for review; and be it further |

RESOLVED, that the results of specialized accreditation review or external review will be communicated to the college dean, the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee, and to the President or his/her designee; and be it further

RESOLVED, that program faculty will have an opportunity to respond in writing to all findings and recommendations raised during the review process; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the President or his/her designee will report to the program, the college dean, and to the Academic Senate Program Review & Improvement Committee within six months regarding recommendations made to the program during the review process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate  
Instruction Committee and the Academic  
Senate Program Review & Improvement  
Committee  
xxxxx, 1996

Adopted

ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROCEDURES  
FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

AS- -96/

RESOLVED, That the attached procedures for external program review be approved,  
and be it further

RESOLVED, the attached procedures for external program review be forwarded to the  
President for approval and implementation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review  
and Improvement Committee

xxxxxx, 1996

## **PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

The purpose of external program review is to provide the opportunity for outside input on academic programs, resulting in suggestions for program improvement. It is recommended that external review occur every five years, preferably taking place the year before the program is scheduled for review by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee.

### **The Review Panel**

The review panel will be composed of three persons not affiliated with Cal Poly. The panel will include at least one academic representative of the discipline from another institution, and may include a representative from industry or a public agency where appropriate. The panel may also include an academic member from a closely related discipline or an academic administrator.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs will prepare a list of at least six potential reviewers. The list of potential reviewers will be developed in consultation with the department and its respective dean. The department will then select review team members from this list. If it is impossible to constitute a review panel from the original list, another list will be prepared.

One of the academic members of the review team will be selected to chair the committee. The chair will be responsible for submitting a final report.

### **Preparation for Review**

In preparation for external review, the following items are to be submitted to the reviewers at least one month prior to their campus visit:

1. Faculty vitae
2. Statement of department mission, goals, and objectives.
3. Curricular requirements, including a comparison to similar programs in California and the nation.
4. An expanded course outline, statement of learning objectives, and syllabus for each course offered by the department. Samples of course materials, student work, exams and other assessments, grading policy, and grade distributions need not be sent prior to the visit unless requested by the review team, but should be available for review during the campus visit.
5. Description of relevant facilities, including library and computer facilities.



6. Program data, including:
  1. Faculty demographics and faculty recruiting plan
  2. Student demographics and student recruitment efforts
  3. Demand for the program, including number of applications received and percent admitted.
  4. Average GPA and SAT scores for entering students and MCA criteria
  5. Retention and graduation rates
  6. Assessment of job market for graduating students
  7. Awards and honors received by students
  8. Involvement with the professional community and industry

### **Campus Visit**

The department will develop a schedule for the campus visit. The campus visit should include meetings with department faculty individually or in small groups, meetings with appropriate administrators including the Department Chair/Head, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and a meeting with representative students. The campus visit should conclude with an exit interview with the Department Chair/Head, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Reviewer Guidelines**

Reviewers should consider the following issues in conducting their review, and should address these issues in their report:

1. Department Objectives
  - a. What are the program goals of the department for the next five years?
  - b. Are department goals and objectives judged to be appropriate given general trends in the discipline?
  - c. How does the department plan to meet its five-year goals?
2. Academic Program
  - a. Program
    - i. How does the academic program compare to that of comparable institutions?
    - ii. What are the distinguishing features of the academic program?
    - iii. What significant changes have been made in the academic program in the last five years?

- b. Curricular Content
  - i. Are there emerging trends or areas within the discipline which should be included or expanded in the curriculum?
  - ii. Are there out-of-date elements which should be phased out or deleted?
- c. Instructional Methods
  - i. Are instructional methods employed and use of technology appropriate given the learning objectives of the program?
- d. Learning Objectives
  - i. Are course learning objectives appropriate and linked to observable behaviors that demonstrate or imply competence?
  - ii. What evidence is there about the degree to which students attain these objectives?
- e. Strengths and Weaknesses
  - i. In what ways could the program be strengthened and improved?

### 3. Faculty

- a. Are the faculty active in curricular development, instructional design, and university service.
- b. Is there an appropriate level of professional development across the department faculty?
- c. What research projects are each of the department faculty pursuing?
- d. What consulting and special projects are each of the faculty pursuing, and how are they linked to the academic program?
- e. Is there an appropriate faculty recruitment plan that addresses gender and ethnic diversity goals?

### 4. Summary

- a. Is the department meeting its program, instructional, and learning objectives?
- b. What are the strengths and achievements of the program?
- c. What suggestions for improvement can be made?
- d. What are the most important challenges facing the department?



### **Written Report**

The chair of the review team is responsible for the written report organized around the above guidelines. A draft report should be submitted to the Department for an accuracy check of factual information at least 10 days prior to submission of the final report. The final written report should be submitted no later than 45 days after the review. The report will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with copies to the Dean and Department Chair.

### **Expenses**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will cover the expenses of external review.

### **Post Review Recommendations**

The President or his/her designee will respond to the department, the college dean, and the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee within six months regarding the recommendations of the external review team. The department, in consultation with the Dean, will respond to any concerns, problems, or issues identified in the external review and in the President's response by developing an action plan that addresses these issues. The department's response and action plan shall be presented to the Program Review and Improvement Committee, which will work in consultation and collaboration with the department to implement the plan and monitor its progress.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- 95  
RESOLUTION IN  
SUPPORT OF THE CHARTER GOVERNANCE  
COMMITTEE PROPOSAL FOR THE CAL POLY GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**

- WHEREAS, The Charter Governance Committee has proposed a structure and procedure for the internal governance of the University in those areas affecting all constituencies outside the realms of each constituency's area of exclusive responsibilities; and
- WHEREAS, The underlying purpose of the *Charter Governance Committee Proposal for the Cal Poly Governance Council* is to "utilize a decision making [process] to yield the highest cooperation of all constituent groups within the University"; and
- WHEREAS, To achieve the above stated end of "highest cooperation," the Charter Governance Committee itself employed and urges the Governance Council to adopt the National Association of Women's Centers consensus model [see Attachment A of the Proposal]; and
- WHEREAS, The Charter Governance Council based its Proposal on the underlying principles of Involvement; Efficiency; Timely, Involved Actions; Mutual Responsibility and Accountability; Communication; Consultation; Openness; Environment; and Leadership as stated on pages 3 and 4 of the Proposal; and
- WHEREAS, The area of faculty exclusivity is understood to entail the topics mentioned in Attachment B of the Proposal which paraphrases the tradition of faculty prerogatives, duties and responsibilities as contained in California Law, and resolutions and understandings reached by the CSU Chancellor and Board of Trustees detailed in *PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES: Papers of the Academic Senate, The California State University* (Vol. 1, 1988); and
- WHEREAS, The Proposal does not countenance any restrictions on the prerogatives traditionally enjoyed by the constituent groups but instead attempts to achieve a greater degree of involvement and understanding concerning policies affecting the entire University community by providing a representative forum where significant discussion can occur and consensus may emerge; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly support the attached *Charter Governance Committee Proposal for the Cal Poly Governance Council*; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge its adoption on a trial basis for a period of three (3) years.

Proposed by the Charter Governance Committee  
July 5, 1995

July 5, 1995

**CHARTER GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**  
**PROPOSAL FOR**  
**THE CAL POLY GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**

**Charter Governance Committee Charge**

The Charter Governance Committee was appointed by Vice President Robert D. Koob (November, 1994) to examine the internal governance structure of the campus and its relationship to other constituencies, i.e., the CSU system, State Legislature, statewide student organizations, bargaining units, and the CSU Academic Senate.

The Charter Governance Committee in its early deliberations decided its initial charge would be to develop an internal governance structure for the campus during the academic year 1994-95. Other governance relationships would be addressed in academic year, 1995-96.

The following proposal for a Cal Poly Governance Council was developed in conjunction with the Charter Oversight Committee, the Charter Fiscal Flexibility Committee, and the Charter Employee Relations Committee. The underlying desire on the part of the Charter Governance Committee was to develop a model that will utilize a consensus decision making to yield the highest cooperation of all constituent groups within the University. The Charter Governance Committee adopted the National Association of Women's Centers consensus model for its

own deliberations and recommends its use by the proposed Governance Council. This procedure is described in Attachment A.

In preparing the governance model, the Charter Governance Committee itself adopted a standard of participation that asked each committee member for a commitment to preparedness, openness, excellence and consultation with constituent groups. These standards of participation led to the development of the governance model.

### **Charter Governance Committee Membership**

Appointed to the Charter Governance Committee were:

Juan C. Gonzalez, Vice President for Student Affairs--administration representative,  
Chair  
Eric Doepel, Director, Annual Giving--representing Staff Council  
Pat Harris, Coordinator, Women's Programs and Services--representing Staff Council  
James Conway, Speech Communications Department--representing CFA/Labor Council  
Marsha Epstein, Information Technology Services--representing CSEA/Labor Council  
Reginald Gooden, Political Science Department--representing Academic Senate  
Tom Hale, Mathematics Department--representing Academic Senate  
Diane Michelfelder, Philosophy Department--representing Academic Senate  
Yvonne Archibeque--student representative  
Erica Brown, ASI President--student representative  
Clint Reherrmann--student representative  
Robert Koob, Vice President for Academic Affairs--administration representative  
Wesley Witten, community advisory member  
Lorraine Ridgeway, recording secretary

### **Guiding Principles Utilized by the Charter Governance Committee**

In an effort to guide the Charter Governance Committee in developing models for governance, the following guiding principles were adopted. They would serve as a

basis for developing a new governance structure and setting standards for performance. These principles are:

- Involvement. All constituents across campus should be involved in all issues; however, the degree of involvement may vary depending on the interest, need, and time constraints imposed by the nature of the issues.
- Efficiency. The University's current and prospective needs and demands require increased efficiency, that is, more accomplished with fewer resources. Accordingly, governance actions and processes must strive for efficiency.
- Timely, Involved Actions. Conclusions and results should be timely to satisfy needs and capture opportunities. Involvement means addressing both immediate and pressing as well as strategic long-term issues with approaches that are innovative, responsible, and anticipatory.
- Mutual Responsibility and Accountability. All constituents must participate with a high level of trust in order to initiate and facilitate change. To achieve this high level of trust, all participants must act responsibly and be accountable for their actions.
- Communication. Communication must be open and thorough.
- Consultation. All constituents need to be consulted for input and involved in the conceptualization and implementation of change.
- Openness. The entire process must be open and accountable to all constituents.

- Environment. All elements of the institutional environment, that is all constituent groups need to be identified and included. Some actions will impact constituent groups outside the institution such as community members and alumni.
- Leadership. Leadership must be active, vigorous and decisive to shape an institutional vision and implement changes to realize Cal Poly's goals.

## **COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED CAL POLY GOVERNANCE MODEL**

### **I. Authority**

It is proposed that the Cal Poly Governance Council have authority to address all issues not governed by areas of exclusivity. Exclusivity is defined as those areas that are delegated or mandated to other groups by either Board of Trustee policy, Title V, and/or California State Code (HEERA). The four areas of exclusivity defined by the committee are:

- Presidential Authority (the President)
- Mandated Student Control of Fees (A.S.I.)
- Employee Relations, Terms and Conditions of Employment (exclusive bargaining units)
- Faculty Retention/Promotion/Tenure and Evaluation; Curricular Curriculum Content (Academic Senate)



The Cal Poly Governance Council will focus its energies primarily on the development and review of policies. As the policy governing body, the Governance Council will also evaluate how policy is implemented.

The Cal Poly Governance Council will require sub groups to exist in order to deal with areas of exclusivity or other pressing issues on campus. These standing committees will include, but will not be limited to, the Employee Relations Committee. The chair of this and other standing committees will be present at meetings of the Governance Council to provide consultation and to ensure effective communication.

## **II. Cal Poly Governance Council Membership**

The University President will chair the Cal Poly Governance Council as a voting representative of the Administration.

Membership in the Cal Poly Governance Council will be drawn from four constituent groups. These groups are defined as the Academic Senate for faculty; Associated Students, Inc., for students; the Staff Council for staff, and the Administration. Each constituency will be represented by three (3) members for a total of twelve (12) voting members. Every attempt will be made to ensure Labor Council representation through the Academic Senate (faculty) or the Staff Council (staff).

Additionally, the Foundation will be represented either by the Administration or the Staff Council (staff).

Each constituency will determine its own selection or appointment method for its representatives. It is recommended that representative terms be staggered in order to ensure continuity.

### **III. Communications**

Communication is the pivotal component of an effective governing council. Communication is paramount and vital to help increase campus morale, facilitate effective decision making, and create opportunities to involve members of the community. Communication is seen as an important governance function to facilitate responsible action by constituent groups and provide full accountability for joint decision making.

Each constituent group will be held responsible for conveying information to and from the Governance Council. Recommended means of communication include meeting minutes, newsletters, electronic mail, and the student newspaper. University publications should be seen as potential vehicles for increased communication.

The Governance Council and each constituency are expected to prepare their own communication plan and implement it effectively.

Meetings will be generally open to the public with an option to call closed meetings when deemed necessary. Weekly meetings will be scheduled year-round. Confidentiality is not seen as desirable; rather, openness and inclusivity are priorities.

#### **IV. Agenda Setting**

Cal Poly Governance Council agenda items may be offered by any member of the campus community. All agenda items will be submitted to the Governance Council Chair. Agenda items will be prioritized by the Governance Council.

#### **V. Responsibility and Accountability**

Members representing different constituencies will be responsible to those constituencies for all decisions, communication, consultation, and involvement. It is acknowledged that all constituents must participate with a high level of trust to satisfy the demands of the governance structure. The commitment to shared decision making obligates each member to bear the equal responsibility of collective, consensus-based stewardship.

#### **VI. Decision-making Process**

The National Association of Women's Centers consensus model for decision-making will be adopted by the Governance Council. This procedure is described in Attachment A.

#### **VII. Timeliness**

All efforts should be directed toward comprehensive communication and consultation. The ability to have timely involvement may be affected by external forces, the complexity of the issues, the need for constant consultation, and other factors. Timeliness will depend on the nature of the topic.

### **VIII. Resources**

Simply creating a governance council does not provide the necessary ingredients to make it successful. Indeed, institutional investment is a prerequisite. The Cal Poly Governance Council should receive appropriate resources for it to be successful in its charge.

### **IX. Relationship to Existing Structure**

The Governance Council will define official links to on-going structures and processes. These links will be explicit, formal, and consistent.

## A NOTE ON NAWC PROCEDURE

The National Association of Women's Centers uses a consensus model of decision making in all our meetings. Simply, majority does not rule; dissent is considered as part of the process which leads to an acceptable result for all. A group consensus does not necessarily mean a unanimous agreement of each individual, but rather that the decision of the group is reasonable enough that no individual wishes to object to, or block, the decision.

### NAWC CONSENSUS MODEL: BASIC UNDERSTANDINGS

There are some basic understandings that must be understood by each member of the group when using this type of decision making process. In NAWC, we hold the fundamental view that all members are entitled to express themselves regardless of how much time is required for all who wish to speak to be heard. If time does not permit a full discussion, the item should be tabled until full discussion can occur. Similarly, if agreement can not be reached it is appropriate to either send the issue to committee or table the issue to let it rest. Often agreement can be reached after all have reconvened and look at the issue with a fresh perspective. One does not, however, hold the right to disrupt the group process by refusing compromise and becoming "a brick wall" and an obstacle to the decision making process.

We accept that each member brings to the group not only ideas but unique personality and experiences. Individuals and their experiences are always valid and do contribute to the decision making process, even if other individuals do not share similar experiences.

We accept that each one of us has a role as an equal member of the group. We may choose individuals for completing tasks but no member is a hierarchical authority. We are each obligated to help lead the group.

### DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF NAWC

The first aspect of decision making is voicing a proposal. Unlike parliamentary organizations discussion of an issue can occur before a formal proposal is made. A discussion may begin with, "Do you think we should...", or it may begin with "I propose that we..." There is no "wrong" way to bring a matter to the floor for discussion.

After a proposal is made, individuals have several options of response to a proposal that form a continuum from unanimous decision to no decision: Full agreement, acceptance, acceptance with reservation, acceptance with disagreement, and blocking disagreement. Each response and how it is interpreted follows.

**Full agreement-** An individual agrees fully to all aspects of a proposal or



decision. A proposal does not often pass in full agreement unless it is about non complex issues, such as, "Shall we break for lunch now?"

**Acceptance-** An individual agrees to a proposal or decision, but does not hold as much personal attachment to the matter. Most proposals pass with this type of acceptance which holds a "It sounds like a good idea- I can go along with that" type attitude. Such a response seems to be found when setting dates and deadlines. More matters are passed with this type of basic agreement.

**Acceptance with reservation-** An individual agrees to a proposal or decision but holds some doubt, or discomfort about part of the decision. This response may be given in cases such as, "the proposal is that we budget \$2000 for conference scholarships" and as an individual you feel the amount should be less, but you are willing to let the \$2000 figure stand.

**Acceptance with disagreement-** An individual agrees with part of a proposal or decision but holds disagreement with another part of the decision, but is not willing to have their disagreement stop action by the group as a whole. For instance, one proposes that we "donate" our mailing list to a university which is looking for a new director of their women's center. You feel that the university should pay for the list because they have financial resources, yet you do see that the position announcement can be a benefit to our membership. You agree to give the university the list despite that you want them to pay for it.

**Blocking disagreement-** An individual disagrees with a decision, and is willing to have their disagreement stop action by the group as a whole. This response should be used only when there is extremely divergent views. Blocking does not end discussion of an issue but rather begins the search for a negotiated compromise. This position, if used inappropriately, can disrupt the group process. If the group tries to negotiate a new decision and the blocking individual refuses to negotiate, the remainder of the group may determine that the action of the individual has moved from voicing dissent to trying to break down the group and thus the individual has surrendered her role as an equal member of the group. The group may then decide to act without the participation of the blocking individual.

#### THE BENEFIT OF OUR CONSENSUS MODEL

The consensus model used by NAWC allows for open discussion, differing opinions, and for conflict as we make decisions. We believe that this allows us to focus on matters in a realistic and humane manner which ultimately leads to the highest cooperation of our members as we fulfill our mission. Each member is included and there is never a "wrong" time to question procedure, ask for clarification or express your view on the topic at hand. While conflict can be difficult, resolution and ultimate agreement is our reward.



-24-

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

## FACULTY PLAN

In offering our alternative, we have proceeded on the assumption that "The Committee" (Campus Committee, Pipeline, Tunnel, Poly Rump, ... whatever we decide to call it) will function so as to embody the six principles we have entertained so far: Communication, Openness, Consultation, Timely Involvement, Mutual Responsibility and Leadership. We want to restrict its policy-making power to solely those issues which directly affect the entire campus community, for example, parking and the budget. On all other matters, The Committee will function as an entrepot for issues affecting the manifold constituencies of the Campus. Here all groups will have the opportunity to share in a timely manner concerns which bear on them and the community at large. In this way, all will be informed, consulted and have the opportunity to participate in the generation of understanding and the prospect of achieving a comfortable level of consensus. It would be improper for this group to voice the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees or its representative on matters pertaining exclusively or primarily to one or only some of the Campus constituencies. To the degree that The Committee is recommending on matters that involve all the Campus community, it will be incorporating the six principles, and perhaps others as well (for instance, fairness, comity, good manners, generosity, et cetera).

At least some dimensions of Leadership or Mutual Responsibility resides with The Committee in all of its functions, such as when it acts primarily in the capacity of information conduit and mutual soundingboard as well as when it is acting as a policy-making organ. In all its functions, it must express the support of all its constituents otherwise it will lapse into irrelevancy and join the other spooks we are forever attempting to exorcise. How well it maintains the dedication, attention and respect of the community will depend on the importance of the issues discussed. Although all issues may be broached, some (for example, the sacking of the men's and women's basketball coaches) may best be left for the editorial pages of the Mustang Daily. However, the athletic budget allocation would be open for discussion!

Just as the faculty think that there may be issues which exclusively concern one or a few of the constituency groups, so are there some areas over which the faculty remains jealously protective. Among these are the following:

- the Academic Senate is the official voice of the Cal Poly faculty;
- the Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on decisions pertaining to the following matters:
  - minimum admission requirements for students,
  - minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students,

the academic conduct of students and the means for handling infractions, curricula and research programs, developing of policies governing the awarding of grades, minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves, campuswide aspects of academic planning.

the Senate shall be consulted on campuswide aspects of: program review, the basic direction of academic support programs, and policies governing the appointment of the president and academic administrators.

the faculty has the primary responsibility to recommend to the president the criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees, including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions; to determine the membership of the General Faculty; recommend on faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees and auxiliary organizations; and set academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

## FACULTY PLAN

### SCOPE OF AUTHORITY

The Committee's paramount policymaking recommendations to the president would be limited solely to those issues involving the entire campus community, such as, parking or the distribution of the budget. In matters traditionally the prerogative of the faculty, such as the curriculum, the content and definition of what constitutes a baccalaureate class or the qualifications of persons entitled to teach such classes, the faculty insist on having the final say, after appropriate consultation with interested parties, before transmitting their recommendation to the president. Students and administration currently have representation in the senate and committees pertinent to their involvement.

### MEMBERSHIP

The distribution of the members would not be so critical to the faculty so long as the faculty exercise last say over matters recognized as falling under their responsibility and so long as the distribution reflects the fact that this is a university and the academic side must be safeguarded. With that in mind, we suggest the following distribution: five faculty, three students, two staff, and one administrator.

### AGENDA SETTING

This issue will always stimulate controversy because external exigencies may crowd out very important internal concerns. What the Committee is primarily concerned with is taking the long view so as to address issues in such a fashion as to avoid having to be forced into a posture of crisis management. That will take patience and good will on the part of the representatives of the various constituencies. All issues may be given an audience but the members, through the development of mutual trust, have to reconcile themselves to the reality that all won't be given priority. Constituencies will transmit issues through their representatives on the Committee and the Committee will rank and address them as it sees fit.

### RESPONSIBILITY/ACCOUNTABILITY

The Committee will recommend policy on matters pertaining to all and act as a conduit of accurate information to the campus constituencies. Success breeds success, and its function as a source and transmission of information will in time become more secure. Communication flows in both directions and the representatives on the Committee must be watchful not to introduce personal static and other interference with the flow.

### FEASIBILITY

As organizations go, universities have one of the longest traditions of success in the western world. The faculty does not favor disturbing those areas lacking a demonstrative need of repair. The Committee will achieve its greatest contribution to the improvement of campus governance by focussing on those areas needing attention.

### TIMELINESS

Timeliness is defined by the function performed. To the extent that the intent is reaching a consensus on an issue campuswide, the matter is involved and reiterative and will consume what will appear to be countless hours. Our recent experience with the Strategic Plan is a good example of a task consonant with the time expended. On the other hand, a mere piece of information or the quelling of a rumor can be accomplished in the twinkling of an eye--if it emanates from the proper source. This gets us to the next section.

### CONSULTATION & INVOLVEMENT

If the aforementioned categories are sincerely engaged, then consultation, involvement, and the next category, communication, will follow.

### COMMUNICATION

Please see Consultation and Involvement above. Of the three, communication is the easiest and will occur by default if consultation and involvement are seriously pursued.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- -96/  
RESOLUTION ON  
CREDIT FOR ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS**

- WHEREAS, Incoming students with advanced placement credits are already among the best students admitted to the University. Their intellectual growth should be further stimulated and encouraged; and
- WHEREAS, It is common practice elsewhere in the California State University and University of California systems to provide students with specific course credit for advanced placement scores of 3 or higher; and
- WHEREAS, The Visionary Pragmatism report recommends that the University should "award credit towards completion of the program for all standardized advanced placement credit earned by the student with a test score of 3 or higher;" therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That students shall receive specific course credit for all scores of 3 or above; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That departments shall identify specific major and GE&B course credits, rather than "free electives," for the AP exams relevant to their disciplines; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee will evaluate departments' advanced placement policies during the course of their normal review process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate  
Instruction Committee  
April 12, 1996

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- -96/  
RESOLUTION ON  
THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR: FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION**

- WHEREAS, C.A.M. section 481.B.1 states, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday;" and
- WHEREAS, In recent years, including 1996-1997, this stipulation has not been incorporated in the planning of the Academic Calendar; and
- WHEREAS, Failure to start Winter quarter on a Monday results in three Monday holidays, which adversely affects scheduling and instruction; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1 shall be revised as follows:
- Instructional days--~~Whenever possible,~~†The first day of instruction in each quarter ~~will~~ shall be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday.
- and be it further
- RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1. shall be given higher priority in planning the academic calendar than sections 481.A.2 (end Summer Quarter before Labor Day) and 481.A.5 (end Spring Quarter before the second weekend in June).

Proposed by the Academic Senate  
Instruction Committee  
April 18, 1996



Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- 96/  
RESOLUTION ON  
AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS**

- WHEREAS, Faculty hold positions of authority that involve the legitimate exercise of power over others; and
- WHEREAS, Trust and respect are diminished when those in positions of authority abuse or appear to abuse their power; and
- WHEREAS, The issue of appropriate and inappropriate relationships between students and faculty is very complex; and
- WHEREAS, It is the responsibility of Cal Poly faculty to maintain the highest standards of professional ethics; and
- WHEREAS, Cal Poly's Faculty Code of Ethics and the AAUP's Statement on Professional Ethics affirm that (1) professors adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors, (2) they make every reasonable effort to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit, and (3) they avoid any exploitation of students; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That Cal Poly adopt the attached *Policy on Amorous Relationships Between Students and Faculty or Instructional Staff Who Evaluate or Supervise Them*.

Proposed by the Status of Women Committee  
May 13, 1996

## **POLICY ON AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND FACULTY OR INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF WHO EVALUATE OR SUPERVISE THEM**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

May 10, 1996

### **I. POLICY STATEMENT: AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT**

**It is the policy of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo that faculty members or other instructional staff shall not initiate, pursue, or be involved in any amorous or sexual relationships (hereinafter referred to as amorous relationships) with any student whom they are in a position to evaluate or supervise by virtue of their teaching, research, or administrative responsibilities.**

Friendships or mentoring relationships between faculty or instructional staff and students are not proscribed by this Policy, nor is it the intent of this Policy that such non-amorous relationships be discouraged or limited in any way.

Marital relationships are covered separately in the Campus Administrative Manual (Conflict of Interest - section 311.5).

### **II. RATIONALE FOR POLICY**

The University's educational mission is promoted by professionalism in faculty-student relationships, and professionalism is fostered by an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Actions of faculty or other members of the instructional staff that undermine this professionalism jeopardize the University's ability to fulfill its educational mission. Trust and respect are diminished when those in positions of authority abuse or appear to abuse their power.

Faculty members and other instructional personnel exercise power over students, whether in giving them praise and criticism, evaluating their work, making recommendations for their further studies or future employment, or conferring other benefits on them. Because it may easily involve or appear to involve a conflict of interest, an amorous or sexual relationship between a faculty member or other member of the instructional staff and a student entails serious ethical concerns when the faculty or instructional staff member has professional responsibility for the student.

Voluntary consent by the student in such a relationship is difficult to determine with certainty, given the fundamentally asymmetric nature of the relationship. Because of the complex and subtle effects of that power differential, relationships may well be less consensual than the individual

whose position confers power believes, and the faculty or instructional staff member bears a special burden of accountability in any such involvement.

Further, amorous or sexual relationships in which one person is in a position to review the work or influence the career of another may provide grounds for complaint by others outside the relationship when that relationship appears to give undue access or advantage to the individual involved in the relationship, or to restrict opportunities, or create a hostile and unacceptable environment for those outside the relationship. Other students and faculty may be affected by behavior that makes or appears to make obtaining benefits (such as advancing one student over others) contingent on amorous or sexual favors.

### III. DEFINITIONS

As used in this Policy, the term "faculty member" or "instructional staff" means any member of the university community who engages in instructional or evaluative activities of any student who is enrolled in a course being taught by that individual or whose academic work, including work as a teaching or research assistant, is being supervised or evaluated by that individual. Graduate or undergraduate students, when performing official University academic supervisory or evaluative roles with respect to other students, are considered instructional staff for the purposes of this Policy.

As used in this Policy, an amorous relationship exists when, without the benefit of marriage, two persons as consenting partners (a) have a sexual union or (b) engage in a romantic partnering or courtship that may or may not have been consummated sexually.

As used in this Policy, to "evaluate or supervise" means:

- a. To assess, determine or influence (1) one's academic performance, progress or potential or (2) one's entitlement to or eligibility for any instructionally conferred right, benefit or opportunity, or
- b. To oversee, manage or direct one's academic or other institutionally prescribed activities.

### IV. AMOROUS RELATIONSHIPS OUTSIDE THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT

Amorous relationships between faculty members or other members of the instructional staff and students occurring outside the instructional context may also lead to difficulties. Particularly when the individual and the student are in the same academic unit or in units that are academically allied, relationships that the involved parties view as consensual may be disruptive to unit activities and appear to others to be exploitative. Further, in these and other situations, the faculty or instructional staff member may face serious conflicts of interest. In any such situation, therefore, faculty or instructional staff members should be most careful to remove themselves from involvement with any decisions that may reward or penalize the student.

## V. PROCESS AND SANCTIONS

Because of the sensitive nature of such relationships, every reasonable effort should be made to resolve alleged Policy violations on an informal basis if possible. Concerns about problems related to this Policy may be taken to the administrative official most directly involved, excluding the person alleged to have violated this Policy, or to one of the individuals listed below in Section VIII.

Any remedial actions taken through informal procedures by the administrative official most directly concerned, excluding the person alleged to have violated this Policy, will depend on the totality of the circumstances. Efforts should be made to be constructively educational and to be corrective rather than punitive if a Policy violation is found: an acknowledgment of the violation and a commitment not to violate the Policy in the future, along with a warning or other appropriate action directed toward the faculty or other instructional staff member, may be sufficient resolution. In cases where further action is deemed appropriate, sanctions may range from a letter of reprimand to dismissal, all in accordance with applicable University procedures.

## VI. APPEALS

If not satisfied with the administrative official's decision, the faculty member or other member of the instructional staff accused of a Policy violation may proceed, in accordance with established procedures, to the grievance or hearings committees to which he or she otherwise has access.

## VII. ABUSE OF THIS POLICY

Complaints found to have been intentionally dishonest or made in willful disregard of the truth may subject the complainant to disciplinary action, with possible sanctions ranging from a letter of reprimand to dismissal.

## VIII. RESOURCES FOR ASSISTANCE AND INFORMATION

Questions concerning this Policy may be addressed to the University's Director of Affirmative Action (756-2062), Women's Program/Student Life and Activities (756-2476), the Sexual Harassment Advisors (names and numbers are available from Director of Affirmative Action), the Vice President of Student Affairs (756-1521), and the Vice President of Academic Affairs (756-2186).

Copies of the Policy are available from Department Chairs and from the offices listed above. These offices are also prepared to help people understand what the Policy means and what options for resolution are available if they believe they have experienced a problem related to this Policy in connection with their academic study or work at the University.

IX. This policy is effective on and after June 1, 1996.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- -96/  
RESOLUTION ON ALLOCATION OF CAL POLY FUNDS**

- WHEREAS, Current State funding does not provide sufficient funds to maintain the quality of education at Cal Poly while allocating the budget as it has been done in the past; and
- WHEREAS, Cal Poly will have a new source of additional funding, should the Cal Poly Plan concept be adopted; and
- WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan and the Cal Poly Strategic Plan identify the mission, objectives, and goals for maintaining quality education at Cal Poly into the 21st century; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly community of students, faculty, staff, and administration should work diligently to achieve those goals and accomplish those objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the allocation of Cal Poly funds should be explicitly based on those goals and objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That measures for the assessment of the ability of programs to meet the goals and objectives be in place before funds are allocated to those programs; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That all funded programs be given an adequate base support over a reasonable period of time to obtain their objectives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the University community work together in an interdisciplinary spirit to determine those areas which will receive additional funding above the base support; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That those areas receiving funding above the base support level be given sufficient funding to allow them to make significant progress toward meeting their goals; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That those programs receiving additional funding share the information learned from their experiences with the rest of the University community; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate or its designee(s) participate in the development of the budget policies and of budget models, and have continuing input into the distribution of the Academic Affairs' budget.

Proposed by the Budget Committee  
April 30, 1996



Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS- -96/  
RESOLUTION ON  
INPUT INTO CAMPUS PLANNING**

- WHEREAS, Broad dissemination of information concerning campus planning is essential; and
- WHEREAS, Timely dissemination of information concerning campus planning is essential; and
- WHEREAS, Broad campus input into campus planning is essential; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate representation on the Campus Planning Committee be increased from one to two representatives; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the agenda of the Campus Planning Committee be posted at least seven days in advance of any meeting of the Campus Planning Committee both electronically and at specified locations on the campus; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the current Five Year Capital Outlay Program be available in the University Library; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That monthly reports be made available in the University Library on the status of major capital outlay projects in progress; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That CEQA documents associated with projects in progress be made available in the University Library; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That discussions of proposed campus projects be at the earliest formative stage when presented to the Campus Planning Committee; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That provisions be made for conducting open forums on campus planning issues upon request from members of the campus community; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That a yearly report be made by the Campus Planning Committee to the Academic Senate regarding major outlay projects.

Proposed by the Academic Senate  
Executive Committee  
April 30, 1996